


Hoosier Archives was originally a periodic listing of the Diplomacy archives of Walter Buchanan, R. R. #3, Lebanon, Indiana 46052, telephone (317) 482-2824; Archives Director, Postal Diplomacy Congress, and V-P/Treas., International Diplomacy Association. It is now primarily a Diplomacy gazette devoted to articles on good play, demonstration games such as the Multiple Winners Invitational (1972CR) now in progress, rating systems, and game news. Information from the archives is vital for all this and is available to the public as well. Although the archives is virtually complete in at least xerox form, missing undamaged originals are solicited, either for purchase or a loan to permit xeroxing. (See the last archives listing in Hoosier Archives #53 for zines needed.) Many original spares are now available from the archives; more are solicited so as to make them available to others. A subscription to Hoosier Archives is 13/\$2.00 or 6/\$1.00; back issues are 15¢ apiece (20% discount for all available). Ask for #87 to get a list of all articles through #90. This is Albatross Press publication #98.



MULTIPLE WINNERS INVITATIONAL (1972CR)  
(Average Aces Trophy Game)  
Winter 1901

HABSBURG HAD ASSEMBLED EUROPE'S LARGEST ARMY

AUSTRIA:	Builds A Bud, A Tri, A Vie.
(Naus)	
ENGLAND:	Builds A Liv, F Lon.
(McCallum)	
FRANCE:	Builds F Bre, A Par.
(Birsan)	
GERMANY:	Builds A Mun, F Kie.
(Prosnitz)	
ITALY:	Builds F Nap.
(Beyerlein)	
RUSSIA:	Builds A StP.
(Ver Ploeg)	
TURKEY:	Builds F Con.
(Lakofka)	

Spring 1902 Orders are due not later than noon (9:00 A.M. for phone calls) on Saturday, 30 September 1972.

POSITIONS BEFORE SPRING 1902

AUSTRIA:	A Vie, A Tri, A Bud, A Ser, A Run, F Gre.
ENGLAND:	A Liv, F Eng, F Lon, F Nwy, A Bel.
FRANCE:	F Por, A Spa, F Bre, A Par, A Bur.
GERMANY:	A Hol, A Ruh, A Mun, F Kie, F Den.
ITALY:	A Tun, A Ven, F Nap, F Ion.
RUSSIA:	F Swe, A StP, A Gal, A Ukr, F Sev.
TURKEY:	A Bul, F Con, F Ank, A Arm.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS:** There is now a new zine on the market that from all indications will be the best since John Beyer's Impassable came out six months ago. Its name is Carpenter and it is published by Stephen Bell, 5605 Virgilwood Drive, Greensboro, North Carolina 27409. Game fees are \$8.00 with \$4.00 refunded at the end of the game. The purpose of this policy is to attract only serious players that will finish their games and this is a commendable goal indeed.

ACEINGS!  
Fall 1901 (cont.)

MOSCOW (3 September 1901): Lennie la boy fires rapidly on the press front. Undaunted, he "presses" ahead, unmindful of his rear. Fittingly, therefore, he is about to take it up the rear. Not to mention the front and flank. Poor Lennie la boy, victim of his own diplomatic talents, reaps what he has sown. Now if the Garazzy Dutchman just doesn't get double-crossed over Rumania, we'll end the Turkish plague in short order, and MAKE it with those old poppy fields and hash storage bins.

LIVONIA (8 September 1901): (Tune of Waltzin' Matilda)

Once a jolly Platypus  
Camped down on a Turkish-man,  
Under the shade of a highly-flung Pie;  
And he sang as he watched and plopped  
upon the Turkey-man,  
Lennie La Boy,--here's Pie in your eye.

CHORUS: Plopping the Pie,  
Plopping the Pie-ie,  
You'll come a plopping, my dear pie, on he,  
And he sang as he watched and plopped  
upon the Turkey-man,  
No higher than a pie's thigh, poor Lennie  
will be.

GENEVA (VIA MOSCOW) (13 October 1901): The latest break in the sweepstakes has the Cows moving to 256 to 1 for, and the French and Turkish pretenders slipping slightly. The Turks seemed to slip on some slimy, brown, unutterably disgusting material on the stairway to Sevastopol, but reasons for the French downturn were less distinct. Apparently the bettors do not like anything in Paris other than the usual wild behavior of the past demizens, disdaining all elements of "class." Madame Birsane would do well to lower herself...utter depravity seems the best course.

ANKARA (7 September 1901): Brenton--who would trust a person who lies as to his true communication network? After all, you said to Naus that you wouldn't even talk to me. Don't moan so self-righteously when I forward your attack plans to Hal! Consider this battle to the death. I don't want survival at your whim, thank you!

Winter 1901

ANKARA (10 December 1901): The Fall of the House of Ver Plug, Chapter 3: Douglas, the aged butler, led me, with great difficulty, up the 69 stairs to the second landing to my dreary, but well-appointed room. The trip from the den to the Gray Room--how apt I thought--had taken some quarter of an hour. I wondered how poor Douglas kept up with the huge house, but I assumed there was a large enough battery of servants to aid him.

At the stroke of 4 AM I heard a ghastly and blood-curdling scream, followed by a "swoosh" and a "splat" from deep within the bowels of the mansion. Quickly I slipped on my dressing gown and ran to the door. The creak of the century-old door could be heard all the way into the tiny peasant village, I was sure. Yet I could not bother to contemplate the racket as I raced down the staircase. Another series of "scream-swoosh-splat" led me to a door just behind the main staircase. There I confronted Cretin (er, Brenton) Ver Plug as he raced from the kitchen with a meat cleaver held in his hand. His eyes were burning in a dull red hue and his knuckles were white with the force of the grip that held the weapon.

"Will you go with me, William?" he asked. "It may be quite ghastly. I've had to separate them from battle on many a night now!"

"Yes, I must know what that series of noises means!"

Into the brightly-lit stairwell we ran. As we reached the base of the spiral, the light had all but gone out. In a dim light the outline of a huge door could be seen. "Come quickly, but be brave. What you see will horrify you!"

I ran behind him. We took one deep breath and pulled the door open wide. There was Suzanne with her foot upon one corpse, and a huge bloody scythe extended as if ready to reap another life with its swoosh. Before her there were 7 of them, waiting to destroy her.

"She's killed four of them already, in the last three weeks, William. This used to be her suite of rooms when she and LaCupcake were wed. Now she can't stand them here, taking it over! One of these nights they will catch her. She becomes more insane and careless each time she is driven down here by jealous madness!"

"Why don't you kill them for her, Brenton?" I asked.

"Because they are part of the Ver Plug legend. If they all die, so will I, but I can't kill my sister, can I? Oh, God, William, what am I to do?" Brenton bent over and cried

bitter tears as Suzanne held the heptet at bay.

What are they? What is the Ver Plug Legend? Who cares?

**COW PASTURES** (10 December 1901): Suddenly Suzanne spied William standing in the corner shivering with fright. "Leo my darling Cupcake! You've come back to me! Where have you been? I've missed you so!" She raced to him, scythe in hand. In a flash her face turned dark and she scowled, "Why did you leave me, Leo? You left me for another woman, didn't you? How could you...I'll get you for that!" And with a laughing scream that caused poor William's heart to stop beating, Suzanne lunged toward him with the scythe poised for action. Closer she stalked. William was trapped in the corner! Will he escape? Or will Suzanne take her anger at Leo LaCupcake out on him?

**ANALYSIS** (Fall 1901): Rick Brooks, (R.R. 1, Box 167, Fremont, Indiana 46737; comments are invited).

Edi Birsan has suggested in his comments on my analysis of the Grudge Game that I devote the winter to strategic considerations. I feel that it is not possible to more than sketch out these possibilities as I did with Italy last issue. Besides, "splendid strategy may be made abortive by poor tactics, while good tactics may retrieve the most blundering strategy." (George S. Patton, Jr., The Patton Papers, 1885-1940, p. 758) I prefer to consider tactics and let the strategy mainly take care of itself. Again, I can see tactical possibilities much more clearly.

Austria will build AA Budapest and AA Vienna. Trieste is a bit harder to call. AA Serbia (S) AF Albania to Greece indicates a distrust of Italy. So a fleet to match a probable second Italian fleet is most likely. Since Austria felt free to use Serbia to support AF Albania to Greece instead of supporting AA Budapest to Rumania, it looks like he was sure that Russia wouldn't move RA Ukraina (S) RA Galicia to Rumania. Taking Rumania was much more important than taking Greece as Rumania gives the alliance much better position against Russia. It looks like Austria set Russia up.

Turkey will undoubtedly build TF Constantinople and take the Black Sea in the spring. Russia can build either RA Warsaw or RA Moscow. Leaving St. Petersburg open in a necessity as Russia will be gutted in the south without another unit. He probably will be anyway, but it will take longer. Given time, another power might come to his aid.

The west is the interesting area of conflict. England has not committed himself against either of his neighbors while France has gone for Munich, but was blocked out. I'd rate an English-French alliance the most probable at the moment with an alliance between France and Germany only slightly more probable than a three-way alliance. So naturally I'll consider the latter.

None of the three has hurt the other yet. France and Germany could have agreed on a stand-off over Munich. France can build two fleets and go for the Mediterranean while Germany builds GA Munich and GA Berlin and heads for Austria and Russia.

The problem in such an alliance is England. His normal paths of expansion are pretty well blocked. He can be let into the action via convoys through the Mediterranean. I remember one game where Austria, Turkey and Italy were allied that featured a successful convoy of TA Smyrna to Wales. (It was one of Don Miller's games and Banks Mebane was Turkey, as I remember.) But England has another option of his own. Fleets in the Norwegian and Barents Sea will allow him to move an army built in Edinburgh to St. Petersburg on a spring move. By driving down through Moscow and Ukraina, he can be in position to hit the Balkans at least as soon as France and Germany, and most likely, sooner.

The builds should indicate how England is going with EF Liverpool signifying an alliance against France and EF Edinburgh one against Germany. Two French fleets either indicate trouble with England or a suicidal desire to go after Italy. Two French armies would be a strong indication of an all-out attack against Germany. Germany's build of GF Kiel would be anti-English.

The big mystery of the game is why Poderkagg hasn't started dropping garbage on her neighbors. Hoosier Archives is lax on air pollution ordinances.

((Humph! lax on air pollution ordinances, indeed!! But then...on the other hand, you may be right. After all, we did allow such people as Brenton Ver Ploeg and Lenard Lakofka in this game and their press releases are certainly not doing anything to clear the air up around here!))

The Chairman of the IDA Ratings Committee, Doug Beyerlein, presents some thoughtful ideas on rating systems. As you might guess, this is a controversial subject. In fact, we have an article on file by Rick Brooks that denounces the whole lot of them!

# A RATING SYSTEM PHILOSOPHY

by Douglas Beyerlein

Red Walker brought out an interesting point in his article, "The Arbitrary Nature of So-Called 'Objective' Ratings Systems" in Hoosier Archives #81. He expounds on the idea that the arbitrary rating systems (Numenor and Antares) give a more complete coverage of game-end finishes than either the ODD (Organisation de Diplomatie) or CPCL (Calhamer Point Count Listing). This is true, but Rod has side-stepped the real issue involved in the discussion of rating systems. This is rating system philosophy. I hope to move this subject into the light of discussion in the following paragraphs.

This subject of the philosophies behind the various rating systems is very complex. I will only attempt to present my philosophy on this subject and will not presume that I understand the other rating experts' philosophies well enough to speak for them. My philosophy is that it is the rating systems which define the victory criteria and not the GRI Rulebook. I am not saying that the 18 supply center criterion for a win doesn't govern the actual victory in a single game--because it does. What I am saying is that the players who realize sometime during the play of the game that they can't win then look for the best possible finish. What governs their decision of what is the best possible finish is the rating they will receive for some runner-up position. Thus they go to their favorite rating system and see if a second place finish is worth more points than, say, a three-way draw. If it is, then everyone losing may quit trying to stop the front-runner and just try to beat out the others for second place. If the three-way or four-way draw is worth more points than a second place finish, then they may try to stalemate the apparent victor. As ratings continue to play a more significant role in postal Diplomacy, this comparison of non-win finishes will become an even more important influence with the game strategies of the future. Therefore, we must set down now these guidelines to direct the rating policies of the future.

Now we come down to the real guts of the issue. What type of game-end positions do we want the players playing for if they can't win? Should they try for second place, third place, or some type of draw? Rating systems answer that question by how they award points to the non-winners. Here is the difference between the Numenor and Antares systems on one side and the ODD and CPCL on the other. The Calhamer school of thought (ODD and CPCL belong in this category) says that if you can't win, try to stop the front-winner and if you can't or won't do that, then you have lost. If you play for second place you have betrayed the philosophy of the game just as much or more than the first player to be eliminated. Why reward such play? The opposite view is given major emphasis by Red Walker and his Numenor rating system. Red's views are reflected in the strengths he assigns to non-win, non-draw finish situations in the Numenor system (see Hoosier Archives #74 for an analysis).

The question is what type of rating system will best promote good play in the game of Diplomacy. Do we want people playing for second or third place? Or, should the players be encouraged to gamble on stopping the apparent winner to achieve success in the game? This type of decision must be made. It is my opinion that we should encourage the best balance of power play possible. This is where the arbitrary rating systems (Numenor and Antares) fail. Only the ODD and CPCL systems promote the idea of balance of power to prevent playing for second and third place because they do not award point for such finishes. In time, they will improve the quality of play in the game because of this fact. This is why it is only a matter of time before the postal Diplomacy community proclaims either the ODD or the CPCL, or a system with similar features, the official rating system for the game of Diplomacy.

---

INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION: For information on how you can join this rapidly growing service organization, write the Membership Chairman, Steve Bell, at 5605 Virgilwood Drive, Greensboro, N.C. 27409. Among the many benefits of membership is included a subscription to the very informative Diplomacy Review.

THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION'S

First Postal Diplomacy World Championship Tournament

1. Forty-nine entries will be seeded into seven games. The purpose of seeding the players is to divide, as equally as possible, the strongest players among the seven games, to avoid having any two players from the same area and to avoid collusion. Each of the winners of the seven games will then compete in the finals for the honor of being Diplomacy's World Champion.
2. There will be one or more additional games to provide alternate winners to play in the finals, if there are stalemates in any of the first seven games, and to be standbys in the finals.
3. Rules: (1) The rules will be essentially those of the 1971 Rulebook with some variations. (2) Anyone is eligible to compete. (3) There will be at least one standby player for each game. (4) The games will be conducted in Atlantis by Gamesmaster Chris Schleicher. (5) In the event of any disputes, clarifications or modifications of any nature during the contest, the final arbiter will be the Chairman of the Board of THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION, John J. Beshara.
4. Prizes: (1) Winners of all games and the best player in all stalemated games receive their choice of a wargame manufactured by Games Research Inc., through the courtesy of its President, John R. Moot. (2) For the World Champion, a beautiful, engraved trophy donated by John Beshara; a free entry in a game in Graustark, Liaisons Dangereuses, Atlantis and Erehwon given by John Boardman, Len Lakofka, Chris Schleicher and Rod Walker, respectively; a free entry in the next Hoosier Archives multiple winner trophy game, courtesy of Walt Buchanan; a one year subscription to Boast and Stench given by Herb Barents; plus a valuable surprise prize donated by THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION. (3) Herb Barents is giving the runner-up a one year subscription to Boast and is also giving a free game in Boast to the first players eliminated in each of the first seven games, "no losers may be winners, too." Walt Buchanan is also giving a one year subscription to Hoosier Archives to the best over-all player in the alternate games. John Boardman is also giving a one year subscription of Graustark to the best player in any of the first seven games that are stalemated. Chris Schleicher is also giving a one year subscription of Atlantis to the best standby player in the first seven games.
5. Entryfees: \$7 per game for players. \$5 per game for standbys. Entryfees include a subscription to Atlantis until the conclusion of all games in the tournament for which an entry fee is paid. When all games are filled, players paying an entryfee of \$7 will automatically be allocated standby positions, if openings are still available, and will be refunded \$2. Subscription rates: \$5 for all games in the first round or \$10 for the entire tournament; subscribers may assume standby positions, if openings become available. Checks must be made payable to Chris Schleicher but must be mailed to John Beshara, 155 West 68th Street, New York, N.Y. 10023. Players should include a listing from 1 thru 7 of their country preferences.

(THE DIPLOMACY ASSOCIATION is not liable for the failure of the publisher, or those donating prizes, to fulfill their commitments.)

(John Beshara asked that we print the above announcement taken from Wazir #4. In addition we would like to recommend this tournament highly. Although the International Diplomacy Association would probably have to concur to make this generally accepted as a world championship (and the British Diplomacy Club and the Belgium Diplomacy and Strategy Association too), nevertheless, the successful completion of this tournament can only further the status of postal Diplomacy. I therefore urge you to participate. Chris Schleicher is one of the most reliable GM's in the hobby and in addition he will have John Beshara and others to help him out. I understand that the tournament will run with 2½ week spring and fall deadlines with 1 week for winter builds, which will make these games the fastest run that are generally available today. Also if my mathematics is correct, the tourney winner alone will get around \$75.00 in prizes. So send in your entry fee today!)